1: Karsten--15 (1916-18) 1935 Jivaro
116, 127 (1928-29)

"Since this work is wholly founded on my own investigations and personal observations of Indian life, I very seldom refer to the writings of other travellers, and only in exceptional cases shall I correct such mistakes as I have found in the litterature on the Jibaros.

A considerable part of my results have been previously published in the following essays and works: --'Mitos de los indios Jibaros (Shuāra) del Oriente del Ecuador', in Boletin de la Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Historicos Americanos, No: 6. Quito-Ecuador, 1919; Contributions to the Sociology of the Indian Tribes of Ecuador (Acta Academiae Aboensis. Humaniora, I:3. Abo, 1920; Beiträge zur Sittengeschichte der südamerikanischen Indianer (Acta Academiae Aboensis. Humaniora, I:4). Abo 1920; 'The Religion of the Jibaro Indians of Eastern Ecuador', in Boletin de la Academia Nacional de Historia, Vol. iv., Nos. 10 and 11. Quito-Ecuador, 1922; La lengua de los indios Jibaros (Shuāra) del Oriente del Ecuador (Oversikt av Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar. Bd. LXIV. 1921-1922); Blood-Revenge, War, and Victory-Feasts among the Jibaro Indians of Eastern Ecuador. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 79. Washington, 1923. The Civilization of the South American Indians. (London, Kegan Paul, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1926); Ceremonial Games of the South American Indians (Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. III, 2, 1930)."

2: Stirling--IX [2] (1930-1931) 1938 Jivaro
116, 127

The chief value of the present work is the assembling and presentation for the first time in English of most of the known early source material. This, together with the illustrations, constitutes the principal justification for the publication of the present volume. The translations are the work of Marion Stirling. They have been made as literal as possible in order to preserve the style of the original writers, which in many cases is cumbersome and involved. Frequently entire accounts are written without punctuation. When it has seemed necessary a certain amount of punctuation has been supplied for the sake of clarity.

The collection of source material has been greatly facilitated by the nineteenth century researches of such scholars as Jiménez de la Espada, Gonzáles Suárez, Francisco Maria Compte, Fernando de Montesinos, and Luis Torres de Mendoza."

2: Stirling--IX[3] (1930-1931) 1938 Jivaro
116, 127

"Among modern ethnographers the works of Rivet and Karsten are outstanding. The latter has recently compiled in a single volume the bulk of the material contained in his previous scattered publications in various languages.(1) Rivet's report (2) suffers from the fact that he did not have the opportunity of doing field work among the Jivaro and as a result could not check the errors of his authorities. It seems to the writer that Karsten's report loses some of its value through the application of too much anthropological theory in such fashion that it is often difficult to detect which information has been obtained directly from the Indians and which is a result of the author's interpretations."

"1. Karsten, 1935
2. Rivet, 1907."

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

Jivaro Souls

MICHAEL J. HARNER
University of California, Berkeley

THE Jivaro proper (*auñtsuri tsaro*) of eastern Ecuador have long been famous for their warlike practices,[1] but the assumptions about reality upon which they predicate such behavior have not been systematically studied and analyzed.[2] A very important series of these assumptions is to be found in the Jivaro ideas concerning souls. Among these concepts has recently been discovered a deep-seated belief that killing leads to the acquisition of souls which provide a supernatural power conferring immunity from death. The purpose of the present paper is to outline some of the basic elements of these beliefs with the hope of providing a greater insight into Jivaro behavior.[3]

The emphasis here will be on presenting new data collected in 1956-57,[4] but the concluding paragraphs of the paper embody a commentary on relevant statements in the major publications dealing with this subject. At the outset it should be mentioned that I took the two most useful works on the Jivaro (Karsten 1935; Stirling 1938) into the field and went over them in detail with native informants. Accordingly, points of difference between the following material and that given by Karsten and Stirling should definitely be taken by the reader to indicate modification or refutation of the previously published statements, at least in regard to the Jivaro proper.[5]

Field research providing the present data was conducted for ten and a half months in the following river valleys occupied by the Jivaro: the Río Upano and its tributaries, the Río Tutanangoza and the Río Sepa; the Río Chiguaza; the Río Macuma; the Río Cangaimi; the Río Cusuimi; the Río Mangosiza; and in a refugee Jivaro settlement near Bucay on the western slope of the Andes. Informants who contributed particularly to the information embodied in the present paper were: *MukuimpU*, *TsakimpU*, *Utitl Akaiu*, *Kugutl*, and *Uata Akaiu* of the Río Tutanangoza; *Matu* of the upper Río Macuma; and *Hintal* of the Río Cangaimi. Chief interpreters were *HwapA*, *Tugi*, and *Naita*, all from the Río Tutanangoza region.

The best information on supernatural concepts was obtained in intensive eight or nine hour daily interviews with single informants over periods of a few days to several weeks. This was an exhausting procedure for all involved: interviewer, interpreter, and informant, but was conducive to the elicitation of truthful detail. Informants' accounts were continually cross-checked and contradictions called to their attention individually. An informant, when thus confronted with a contradiction, and with his reputation for knowledge and veracity at stake, generally provided elaborative supporting detail which he might not have otherwise volunteered.

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

from natural forms of life or other natural phenomena. Stirling (1938:116) also errs in stating that "All of the principal nature gods . . . contain powerful *tsarutama*." In fact, it is highly questionable whether there are any supernatural figures whom the Jívaro could be said to view as gods. Stirling's candidates for gods are primarily "Piribri, the Rain God," and "Pangi, the great anaconda River God." Any such deities are not part of the supernaturalism of the Jívaro proper. Karsten (1954:26) has already taken note of this situation, saying, "But the Jíbaros have no belief in a personal Raingod Piribri." Actually, *pirípiri* is the correct term and refers to a plant which the Jívaro use magically to cause rain to swell the rivers so that their enemies cannot cross successfully. But it is not a god. The actual supernatural role of "Pangi" (*pagi*) is not significantly greater than has been indicated in the preceding descriptions of the arutam and muisak souls. Karsten (1954:31) is also correct in rejecting a claim for a Jívaro deity named "Cumbanama" (see Steward and Metraux 1948:626), a claim simply deriving from a casual statement by an early traveler in the Jívaro country. While on the subject of supposed Jívaro gods, it might as well be mentioned that Karsten's (1935:125 26) candidate for an "Earth-mother" goddess really refers to a class of female spirits (*nunúi*) which can probably be best defined as crop fairies. She (or really, they) also has no husband, despite such a claim by Karsten (1935:379).

In regards to the muisak, Karsten (1935:430) was aware of the potentially harmful nature of the spirit of a slain enemy, but does not report some of the major beliefs surrounding it, nor is he apparently cognizant of this term for the avenging spirit while it resides in the tsantsa. He (1954:21) is wrong when he states that the sloth shrunken head is not called "tsantsa." Nor can I agree with him when he says (1954:16): " . . . I have indicated the real purpose of the tsantsa, and in my statements, founded on personal observations and most careful inquiries, there is nothing to add and nothing to correct."

Stirling does not mention an avenging soul or spirit. While he notes (1935:74) that the tsantsa possesses magical power, he incorrectly identifies such power as "tsarutama," when it is really power emanating from the muisak.

Karsten fails to distinguish the nëkás wakanI and thus, since he uses the term wakanI alone, it is difficult to tell when his remarks apply to this particular soul. He is definitely wrong in his statement (1935:372) that: " . . . animals, plants and inanimate objects . . . seem to be conceived simply as disembodied human souls." What is fact is that no plants or inanimate objects are believed to *be* souls (although a few specific plants *have* souls) and only a few animals (e.g., deer, owls) are believed to be such. All other creatures with blood are thought to *have* some kind of true soul. Stirling never mentions wakanI.

To the reader who wonders whether some of these conflicts are due to culture change during the intervals between fieldwork by the different investigators, I submit the fact that several of my most important informants were already raising families prior to Karsten's initial Jívaro fieldwork in

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

1916–1918 and did not come into significant firsthand contact with Whites until 15 to 20 years later. Stirling's fieldwork came after Karsten's, in 1930–31. The informants were also aware that what was wanted was the traditional Jívaro view, with recent innovations in belief being recorded separately.

Finally, there remains the question of whether the contradictions between the several investigators' reports stem in part from the fact that both Karsten and Stirling visited other Jívaroan tribes (i.e., Achuara, Huambisa, and Aguaruna) in addition to the Jívaro proper. In order to assess this possibility, I queried linguists who had been making prolonged investigations among the Huambisa and Aguaruna, and also personally questioned several Aguaruna, Huambisa, and Achuara men.[18] As a result, it was determined that Stirling's term "tsarutama," for example, is completely unknown in all the Jívaroan tribes, "arutam" being used by the Achuara and Huambisa and "*ahutan*" by the Aguaruna. Likewise reported absent are any beliefs in Stirling's rain or anaconda "gods" or in Karsten's earthmother "goddess." In fact, these cursory inquiries suggest that the soul belief systems of the other Jívaroan tribes may prove to be basically similar to that sketched here for the Jívaro proper.

NOTES

[1] This tribe (dialect group) dwells, roughly speaking, between the Río Pastaza in the north and the upper Río Zamora in the south; and from the 3,500 foot contour elevation of the eastern slope of the Andes in the west to the Río Pangui in the east. The *untsuri huara* comprise the Jívaroan tribe which is usually referred to in the existing literature as the "Jívaro proper," "Jívaro," "Jíbaro," "Ecuadorian Jívaro," or "*Shuara*." This last term, *huara*, does not mean "Jívaro," as often has been stated, but is used by the Jívaro proper to refer to any Indian or group of Indians without regard to cultural or linguistic affiliation. "*Untsuri huara*," meaning "numerous Indians," is the designation applied to this tribe by its close eastern Jívaroan neighbor, the Achuara tribe (*achuara huara*). Most of the serious anthropological information published on Jívaroan culture so far has been on the *untsuri huara* or Jívaro proper. The other Jívaroan tribes definitely known to be in existence today are the Achuara (Achúal), Huambisa, and Aguaruna.

The following Jívaro orthography is partially based on that developed by Glen Turner of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. He is not responsible, however, for oversimplifications presented here. These approximate values are assigned to the following phonemes:

Vowels

- a Spanish *a*
- e English *i* in *sit*
- i Spanish *i* (nasalized when adjacent to n)
- u Spanish *u*

Consonants

- c Spanish *ch*
- h English *h* (palatized; labialized when preceded by u)
- k English *h* (palatized when following *i* or *i* plus a nasal consonant)
- m Spanish *m*, but more palatised and labialized
- n Spanish *n* (palatised when following *i* or *i* plus a nasal consonant; voiced like Spanish *n* when *i* is adjacent)

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

g English *ng* in *sing* (followed by a hard *g* sound when not the terminal phoneme)
p Spanish *p* (voiced like English *b* when following a nasal consonant, labialized when preceding *e*; palatized when following *e* or *i* plus a nasal consonant)
r Spanish *r*
s Spanish *s*
š English *sh*
ts English *ts* in *cats*
t Spanish *t* (voiced like Spanish *d* when following a nasal consonant; palatized when following *e* or *i* plus a nasal consonant)
w English *w* (but voiced like English *b* when adjacent to *i*)
y Spanish *y*

Unvoiced vowels (restricted to ultimate syllables) are capitalized. Stress is on the penultimate syllable unless otherwise noted. A tilde indicates nasalization.

[1] A more detailed presentation is intended for inclusion in a future monograph.

[2] The fieldwork was sponsored primarily by the Henry L. and Grace Doherty Foundation, with supplementary grants provided by the Department of Anthropology and the Museum of Anthropology of the University of California, Berkeley, by the American Museum of National History; and by the American Anthropological Association (SKF contract grant). John H. Rowe of the University of California contributed greatly to the undertaking of the fieldwork through his encouragement and advice.

[3] I wish to acknowledge my debt to these two previous fieldworkers. Their material provided innumerable leads for investigation and made my own research much more productive than it otherwise would have been.

[4] Arutam may also be pronounced *arutma*, since the final vowel and consonant are interchangeable, as is the case with many Jivaro words. See Turner (1958) for a discussion of this and some other linguistic aspects of Jivaro.

[5] Jivaro faith in the existence of arutam souls is so strong that all persons interviewed on the subject, even adolescents raised in mission boarding schools in the Río Upano valley, expressed a complete conviction in their reality.

[6] One of the members of the party may drink an infusion of *maikua* (*Datura* sp.) instead of tobacco water. Usually this is a person who has never seen arutam and therefore takes the drug to increase his chances of success. The other members of the group abstain from maikua in order to be able to restrain and protect the delirious person under its influence.

[7] One exception is the fireball arutam which only vanishes silently when touched.

[8] Persons who have seen arutam can be surprisingly well singled out by this trait alone.

[9] There is also a rare super arutam, *awsag*, whose soul is not so easily satisfied and does not leave the body of its possessor when such declarations are made.

[10] The arutam soul resident in the body of a person is *not* his *own* soul in any permanent sense, but only the soul of some ancestral Jivaro dwelling there temporarily.

[11] Visitors to the Jivaro are usually impressed by the near shouting which typifies conversations between Jivaro of different households and neighborhoods. The functional basis for this custom can be seen in the desire of the individual to advertise his arutam power by being forceful in speech and gestures.

[12] Muisak may be alternatively pronounced *muisha*.

[13] When a man does not cut off the head of a person he has murdered (i.e., when the victim belongs to his own tribe), he turns the corpse face down on the ground so that the victim's muisak is delayed in emerging through the mouth. Thus the murderer hopes to reach home before the avenging soul can catch him.

[14] A rather astonishing amount of misinformation has been published regarding the beliefs surrounding the tsantsa. I wish to re-emphasize that any contradictions between the information presented here and previous accounts indicates rejection of that material.

[15] The Jivaro practice shifting cultivation and move their house sometimes along with their gardens.

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

225
825

[11] Possibly this is due to the fact that the old clearings provide feeding grounds for these animals.

114
127
171

[12] Thanks are particularly due to Mildred Larson and David Beasley of the Summer Institute of Linguistics for providing information regarding the Aguaruna and Huambisa beliefs, respectively. I briefly interviewed several Huambisa and Aguaruna men on these points at the Institute's base in Varinacocha, eastern Peru, in January 1961, and questioned an Achuara informant on the same subject in 1957 near the Río Cangaimi, eastern Ecuador.

REFERENCES CITED

113

KARSTEN, RAFAEL
1935 The head hunters of western Amazonas; the life and culture of the Jíbaro Indians of eastern Ecuador and Peru. Societas Scientarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, vol. 7, no. 1. Helsinki.
1954 Some critical remarks on ethnological field research in South America. Societas Scientarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, vol. 19, no. 5. Helsinki.

STEWARD, JULIAN H. and ALFRED MÉTRAUX
1948 Tribes of the Peruvian and Ecuadorian Montaña. *In* Handbook of South American Indians, vol. 3, Julian H. Steward, ed. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 143. Washington.

STIRLING, M. W.
1938 Historical and ethnographical material on the Jivaro Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 117. Washington.

TURNER, GLEN D.
1958 Alternative phonemicizing in Jivaro. International Journal of American Linguistics 24:87–96.

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

but was still largely isolated from colonists' incursions by the swift, bridgeless Rio Upano and its often deep canyon (see Plate 1), which acted as an obstacle throughout its length to eastward migration by the horse-dependent settlers. These localities (excluding missions and their environs) had, together with other areas of minimal white penetration, an estimated total population of approximately 2,205 persons. Beginning with Chapter II, the present tense will be used to describe interior Jívaro culture as it existed at the time of the original fieldwork. In other words, the "ethnographic present" is 1956–57.

Whether this population in the northern and eastern portion of the tribe was larger or smaller than in previous decades is difficult to determine in the absence of written records. It does appear, however, that three of the localities involved, the Río Chiguasa region, the middle Río Macuma area, and the Rio Yaupi Valley, were not occupied by the Jívaro until around the turn of the century. These occupations were the consequence of head-taking raids by the Jívaro which forced the Achuara (*ačuarā šuarā*) to retreat northeastward from the Chiguasa and middle Macuma areas and the Huambisa (*tsumu šuarā*) to withdraw southward from the Yaupi region. This territorial expansion by the Jívaro was a by-product, rather than a conscious purpose, of their *tsantsa* raids against these adjacent tribes.[36]

Once vacated, such formerly enemy-held regions attracted Jívaro from the Rio Upano Valley, elderly *untsuri šuarā* informants explained, because the hunting and fishing were better than in the Upano area. The superior hunting and fishing were also given as the reason that families had, for decades at least, moved eastward across the Cordillera de Cutucú to join their tribesmen already settled there. Later, when white colonists entered the Upano Valley in large numbers from the

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

dwell south of the present Ecuadorian border, which prevented the author from visiting them and making a field comparison.

The Achuara, whom the author did visit, are frequently confused with the Jívaro in the literature and also are commonly included in the latter term by Ecuadorians who are not familiar with the distinctions between the two tribes or dialect groups. Salient cultural features that distinguish the Achuara from the Jívaro include the following: permanent matrilocality; weaving is done by the women, the women wear a topless skirt rather than a dress over one shoulder; the men's kilt is predominantly white rather than reddish-brown; two doors are commonly located in the women's end of the house; a stockade may be built outside the house in times of heightened hostilities; at other times houses often have no walls at all. The permanent matrilocality results in household populations considerably in excess of those normally found among the Jívaro, which has contributed to contradictions in the literature by explorers and others who were unaware, in fact, that they were among the Achuara.

13. Ceza de León, 1943, pp. 295–96; González Suárez, 1890, p. 54. Many of the sources cited by Stirling, 1938, in his compilation of historical materials, are not utilized here because they actually refer to Jívaroan groups other than the Jívaro proper (*untsuri shuara*).

14. Jiménez de la Espada, 1965, Tomo 4, pp. 174–77.

15. It was probably at about this time that the Jívaro initially obtained chickens and pigs. The presence of pigs among the Jívaro is first definitely reported in 1683 by Lucero, 1892, p. 37. However, records are so fragmentary that it seems safe to assume that this report could have followed the actual introduction by a century or longer.

16. Velasco, 1842, p. 151; Lucero, 1892, p. 33. The present writer is inclined to place Sevilla del Oro on the middle Río Upano (the Sucúa-Huambi area), because significant placer gold deposits do not occur on the upper portion of the river and because early reports of its latitude seem more consistent with such a location.

17. Jiménez de la Espada, 1897, p. 45. Translated by the author.

18. Velasco, 1842, p. 153; and n.d., p. 97.

19. Translated by the author from Velasco, 1842, pp. 153–57.

20. Lucero, 1892, p. 34.

21. Accounts of some of these ill-fated attempts may be found in Velasco, n.d., pp. 105–7; 203; 209–10; 286–288; and in Velasco, 1842, pp. 158–60.

22. Jiménez de la Espada, 1897, pp. 43–44.

23. Macabeo oral histories. Cf. also Barrueco, n.d.

24. Oral history provided by elderly Macabeos and Jívaro; Compte, 1885, p. 56; Vacas Galindo, 1895, p. 49; Villavicencio, 1858, pp. 366, 420–21.

25. From oral histories given by elderly Jívaro.

26. E.g., Bollaert, 1863.

27. Anonymous, 1952, p. 30. During the 1870's, the population of Macas was estimated to be 300 (Reiss, 1880, p. 329).

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

000 [123] 2. The author has never participated in a war expedition, although he was invited to join one emanating from the Río Chiguasa region against the Achuara in 1957. The description which follows, therefore, is based entirely on informants' accounts.

3. The chant is recorded in Harner, 1972.

171 439 177 765 532 727 778 [825] 4. The Jívaro, their Jivaroan neighbors, and the Candoshi are the only people within the past few centuries known to make the *tsantsa*. In addition, the Jívaro claim that the Achuara and the Huambisa learned the art from them in fairly recent times and formerly did not cut off heads in war. The Candoshi, in turn, state that they learned the practice fairly recently from the Achuara and Huambisa (Wallis, 1965, pp. 37–40). During the earlier decades of the present century, the craft was practiced by unscrupulous entrepreneurs using the heads of unclaimed dead in Guayaquil and Panama, which they passed off as Jívaro to tourists (see Karsten, 1935, pp. 81–82; Stirling, 1938, pp. 76–78; and Up de Graff, 1923, footnote, p. 283). Sometimes they went so far as to shrink the skins of entire bodies, a practice which, when I described it to Jívaro informants, was greeted with incredulity. The sale of shrunken heads is illegal in Ecuador and only imitations (although sometimes the sellers pretend they are not), made from monkey heads or the skins of other animals, now seem to be marketed.

000 [551] 5. Name of the victim. The victim's name is usually learned from captured women or from persons who have interacted with the Achuara in trade.

CHAPTER VI

[821] 1. The appearance of this comet is well remembered, and in fact informants recalled that in one neighborhood some Jívaro attempted to reach it by building a wooden tower!

[127] 2. Vacas Galindo, 1895, p. 49; Compte, 1885, p. 56; and oral histories recorded by the author.

3. *Head Hunters of the Amazon* by F. W. Up de Graff, 1923 (Dodd, Mead and Company).

4. The introduction of a few steel tools to the frontier Jívaro in the vicinity of Macas in the mid-nineteenth century may have increased garden size and production at that time, judging from oral traditions. However, oral information on events so far in the past is not included as evidence in this account of cultural change. A previous version of this material, with comparative data, appeared in Harner, 1968b.

EPILOGUE

[114] 1. I am indebted to Padre Shukta and Peter Hart for their assistance in obtaining some of the information contained in this section.